


OCIC-M74-122  
9 December 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR: QC ADP Systems Administrator

FROM : Chief, Information Control Staff, OC

SUBJECT : Justification for Automated Records Control Proposal

REFERENCE : OCIC-M74-105, 3 October 1974 

1. As mentioned in paragraph 3 of the reference, the main benefit to be realized by implementing the records control automation proposal will be the attainment of new capabilities that we would be unable to develop in a manual system, although cost savings will also be attained. We outline below the way our present system operates, how the proposed system differs, and the cost savings estimated.

2. Active Records

a. Once a year we physically inventory all OC records. 160 manhours, GS-09 average.

b. Once a year we update the records control schedule for each OC components. 160 manhours, GS-11; 40 manhours, GS-05.

c. We then wait for the OC components to send us their inactive records for retirement to the Records Center. This is a relatively ineffective method of keeping records moving from expensive office space to inexpensive records center space or to the burn bag. We would like to facilitate review of the records by the OC components and thus speed up what is in their eyes a low-priority job. To do this in the manual system would require an additional one-half manyear, GS-11, to screen files in the OC components. This time would be spent identifying each records series with its disposition instructions in the applicable records control schedule. This would have to be done from scratch each year, since file folders are not presently identified with their disposition instructions. This situation exists because of the update problem resulting from frequent records control schedule amendments and office reorganization.

3. Inactive Records

a. We make shelf lists of all folders being deposited in the Records Center (100 cubic feet per year). 50 man-hours, GS-11; 33 manhours, GS-05.

b. We review annually the OC inactive records lists for disposition. 8 manhours, GS-11.

c. We notify OC components to review their inactive records deposits. This process is complicated by the update problem mentioned in 2c above.

d. Items 3a and 3b above would be done automatically under the automated system, with only generalized instructions provided to the computer to produce the new listings.

4. Information Retrieval

a. We receive search requests for inactive records from the OC components. Since the requesting offices in most cases do not have current listings, due to the reorganization/update problem, our searches in the shelf lists may cover up to 1,000 pages, with average search time of one hour. The search problem is compounded by the fact that the shelf lists are organized strictly by original deposit/disposition date, and cannot easily be searched by subject.

b. The automated system will provide us with current listings on the basis of generalized updates and will furnish subject listings cross-referenced to the shelf lists and active file lists. An extreme example of the advantage of the automated list is provided by our April 1974 "Watergate" search which consumed 414 manhours of management time, GS-12 average. We estimate that at least 200 manhours could be saved by automated search in a similar situation.

5. Cost Comparisons

The OJCS feasibility study projects \$7,200 development costs for the automation proposal. Maintenance costs are not mentioned. We project one-time data conversion costs of \$2,500 for 3 man-months, GS-05 at \$10,000 per year, and \$1,300 for 1 man-month, GS-11 at \$16,000 per year, for a total conversion cost of \$3,800. The \$11,000 development and conversion costs will be recovered by the following costs savings:

SUBJECT: Justification for Automated Records Control Proposal

a. Floor space and recordkeeping equipment cost

We estimate that up-to-date records listings will enable us to move at least 5 percent of OC records from active office space to the Records Center or destruction. These records would total some 160 cubic feet stored in 20 safes taking up 200 square feet of office space at \$10 per square foot for a total cost saving of \$2,000. This is a continuing annual saving. Additionally, there would be a one-time saving of \$8,000 by releasing the 20 safes at \$400 each.

b. Salary costs

(1) Shelf lists for input to the records center total some 100 pages per year. 30 minutes per page for inventory and drafting of the list takes 50 manhours, GS-11 at \$8, totaling \$400 per year. 20 minutes per page for typing and proofing takes 33 manhours, GS-05 at \$5, totaling \$165 per year. Automation will annually save \$500 of the \$565 total shelf list preparation cost. Additionally, we will increase our Records Center deposits without appreciably increasing our input costs.

(2) When OC reorganizes, updating the shelf lists (1,000 pages) requires 120 manhours, GS-11 at \$8, totaling \$960, for indexing and reorganizing the lists, and 400 manhours, GS-05 at \$5, totaling \$2,000, for typing and proofing the lists. Thus approximately \$3,000 will be saved periodically when OC reorganizes. Smaller portions of this total will be saved on partial reorganizations.

(3) File listings for the active records in OC offices total some 250 pages and are updated and retyped by each OC office when additions or changes are made or files reorganized. An annual retype of these lists takes 83 manhours, GS-05 at \$5, totaling \$415 for typing and proofing alone, not counting management time for organizing the files. The automated system will save \$300 of this total by eliminating the retyping. Additional savings will be made by the capability to reorganize the files automatically.

(4) The annual records inventory and the updating of records control schedules, applying them to the files, and identifying records for

SUBJECT: Justification for Automated Records Control Proposal

disposition, if done properly, requires one-half manyear, GS-11 average, totaling \$8,000, in addition to the cost of records schedule retyping. By automatically generating lists of records due for disposition, the automated system will save \$4,000 of this total annually.

(5) The average inactive records information retrieval search time of 1 hour adds up to 120 man-hours per year, GS-11 at \$8, totaling \$960. The automated subject search capability will reduce average search time to 10 minutes, thus saving \$800 per year.

(6) Finally, a massive search such as "Watergate" now costs about \$4,000 for 400 manhours, GS-12 average at \$10, of which the subject search capability will save \$2,000. Under present conditions, of course, these searches are infrequent.

c. Cost Savings Summary

(1) One-time Cost Saving:

Safe space	\$8,000
------------	---------

(2) Continuing Annual Cost Savings:

Floor Space	\$2,000
Shelf lists	500
File listings	300
Disposition scheduling	4,000
Retrieval searches	800
TOTAL	\$7,600

(3) Periodic Cost Savings:

Shelf list reorganization	\$3,000
Massive searches	2,000
TOTAL	\$5,000

6. Summary of Benefits

a. The \$11,000 development and conversion costs will be recovered within the first year's \$15,600 one-time and

SUBJECT: Justification for Automated Records Control Proposal

continuing cost savings. The periodic and continuing cost savings will provide recurring savings in future years.

b. The primary benefit of the new system will be improved management control of records storage and retrieval in OC. Keeping infrequently used records out of active offices not only saves storage space and floor space, but also improves the accessibility of files and decreases office filing and retrieval time.

c. Finally, as Mr. Colby pointed out in his recent records management conference keynote address, the amended Freedom of Information Act requires that the Agency not only locate and retrieve records, but also make declassification decisions and final legal rulings within ten days of receipt of requests for information. The automated records control system will help us achieve the response time required to fulfill our part of this requirement.

STATINTL

Distribution:  
Orig - Addressee